

TAB

PROS AND CONS

SUBJECT: Organizational Shift of the Office of Personnel, in Whole or in Part, from the DDA to the DCI Area

A. Present Operating Posture

1. The historical role of the Director of Personnel has been two-pronged: he serves as the senior staff officer to the DCI/DDCI on personnel management and also sits as an operating official within the DDA. On the one hand he provides advice to the DCI/DDCI on personnel policy matters, provides personnel management guidance to Career Service officials responsible for operating the Agency's personnel system and is also responsible for assuring equity in personnel management practices across Directorate lines and for enforcing Agency personnel policy. As an operating official within the DDA, he provides services of common concern.

2. The location of the Office of Personnel in the DDA may have contributed to a role identity problem which has endured for many years. Agency managers, at many levels, view the Office as essentially a service organization; many Agency employees believe the Office's primary responsibility to be that of operating the Agency's personnel system; and members of Agency's top management view the Office's role as being a focal point for personnel management policy development, monitoring, and enforcement, as well as that of personnel management evaluation. In point of fact, the proper role of the Office of Personnel is all three of these because of their interrelationships.

3. On the question of transferring all or part of the Office function to the DCI area, it is clear that significant change could be effected by either.

B. Shift of Part of Office of Personnel Functions to the DCI Area

Should the Office's policy development and enforcement function and that of personnel management evaluation be separated from the other parts of the Office, the impact could be considerable and current issues may become even more complex. A look at the pros and cons of such a move reveal the following:

FACTORS TO CONSIDER

PRO

1. Could strengthen the development of Agency policy formulation and the enforcement of that policy.

CON

1. Would impair D/Pers capacity to provide policy guidance. The Director of Personnel's effectiveness is enhanced by his having collateral responsibility for specific personnel programs and administration.

PRO

2. Would focus on personnel policy responsibility as a function of top Agency management.
3. Would reduce Agency misperceptions relative to the Office of Personnel's responsibility for Agency personnel policy, control and enforcement.
4. Would permit the larger part of the Office of Personnel to continue to function in a manner familiar to Agency employees.

CON

2. Could involve a net resource cost by requiring some additional staffing requirements.
3. Would establish two reporting channels, i.e., direct to DCI on policy and control matters and to the DDA on other personnel functions.
4. The separation of policy formulation and policy implementation would impact adversely on internal OP working relationships where "teamwork" is required and on the effectiveness of personnel programs. Separation would also create confusion externally on the Office continuing liaison on personnel matters with the Office of Personnel Management, Office of Management and Budget, State Department, and other agencies with whom the Office has contact.
5. Would reduce operating efficiency by requiring new intra-system coordination because of split or diffused personnel responsibilities.
6. Could provoke conflict between the two individuals having primary responsibility for split facets of Agency personnel programs.
7. Could complicate policy makers' access to the personnel and personnel program data base.
8. Would complicate internal OP career management and employee career development.

PRO

CON

9. Would increase the size of the Office of the Director.
10. Would appear to go counter to growing tendency elsewhere in government where emphasis is being placed on personnel program integration.

C. Shift of All OP Functions to the DCI Area

1. A shift of the total OP organization from the DDA to the DCI area would create new expectations from both managers and employees as they weigh and analyze the reasons for such a move.

2. Specifically, a look at the short-term impact of a total office move raised several questions indicated as follows:

FACTORS TO CONSIDER

PRO

CON

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Could strengthen the development of Agency policy formulation and the enforcement of that policy.2. Would focus on personnel policy responsibility as a function of top Agency management.3. Would reduce Agency misperceptions relative to the Office of Personnel's responsibility for Agency personnel policy, control and enforcement.4. Would keep OP functions meshed and minimize difficulties or confusion related to managing and reporting responsibilities. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Could affect the present personnel system with respect to personnel management responsibilities by strengthening the role of the Office in conjunction with the current responsibilities of the Career Services.2. Would require clarification of authorities and responsibilities as managers perceive a possible change in personnel management accountability for achieving personnel objectives (because of the organizational shift).3. The direct link of D/Pers to the DCI and DDCI is readily usable under present organizational alignments. |
|--|--|

PRO

5. Would enhance the policy role of the Director of Personnel and provide more direct access to other Agency officials.
6. Would enhance the desired coordination between Agency program management and personnel management by bringing the Office into the same Career Service as that of the Comptroller.
7. Would simplify D/Pers reporting channels by eliminating the dual nature of present system involving the DDA.
8. Would tend to alter employees perceptions of the Office by emphasizing the importance of the personnel function of top managers.
9. Would strengthen the role and impact positively on the effectiveness of the personnel officer serving Agency components.
10. Would favorably influence the work performance of any personnelists inhibited by a perception of separation from top management or who felt unsure of having its support.
11. Would decrease the size of the DDA.
12. Would give the "E" Career Service the extra strength needed to make it more comparable to the other Career Services.

CON

4. Present Office functions have been well established and are currently accepted under the present arrangement. A change in organization location could disrupt this equilibrium.
5. Would increase the size of the Office of the Director.
6. Could affect current DDA promotion targets following a loss of ceiling for some 73 grade points above the GS-06 level for that Directorate (end of October 1979).